

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Cardin | Hunter | Reynolds |
| Carson | Israel | Rohrabacher |
| Culberson | Istook | Ross |
| Davis (FL) | Jefferson | Ruppersberger |
| Davis, Tom | Jenkins | Shimkus |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Jones (OH) | Simpson |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Kilpatrick (MI) | Slaughter |
| Etheridge | Kingston | Sodrel |
| Fattah | Kirk | Souder |
| Filner | Kucinich | Stark |
| Ford | LaTourette | Strickland |
| Fossella | Matsui | Sweeney |
| Gonzalez | McHugh | Taylor (MS) |
| Gordon | Michaud | Terry |
| Gutierrez | Murtha | Turner |
| Harris | Oxley | Walden (OR) |
| Higgins | Payne | Weiner |
| Hobson | Pryce (OH) | Wynn |
| Honda | Rahall | Young (FL) |

□ 1915

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 323, on H. Con. Res. 155, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Monday, June 27th and missed the rollcall votes ordered. Had I been present, I would have voted as noted below:

Rollcall vote 322: "yea"; rollcall vote 323: "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was regrettably delayed in my return to Washington, DC, and therefore unable to be on the House floor for rollcall votes 322 and 323. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" for rollcall vote 323, and "yea" with reservation for rollcall vote 322 on House Resolution 199, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal business prevents me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, June 27, 2005. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 199, a resolution expressing the sense of the House regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995 (Rollcall No. 322); and "yea" on H. Con. Res. 155, a resolution urging the Government of the Republic of Albania to ensure that the parliamentary elections to be held on July 3, 2005, are conducted in accordance with international standards for free and fair elections (Rollcall No. 323).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House floor during rollcall votes on H. Res. 199 (Expressing the sense of the United States House of Representatives regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July

1995) and H. Con. Res. 155 (Urging the Government of the Republic of Albania to ensure that the parliamentary elections to be held July 3, 2005, are conducted in accordance with international standards for free and fair elections). I was giving a presentation on the 179th Airlift Wing of the Ohio National Guard in Mansfield, OH at the Base Realignment and Closure Commission hearing in Buffalo, New York. Had I been present for the votes I would have voted "yea" for both measures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 322 and 323.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the fifth amendment to the Constitution states that "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

However, that was then.

Thanks to the recent Supreme Court ruling on eminent domain, the fifth amendment has been vastly expanded.

As one Supreme Court Justice stated in the dissent, "Nothing is to prevent the State from replacing a Motel 6 with a Ritz Carlton, any home with a shopping mall, or any farm with a factory."

Property rights? There is nothing right about this decision. Now, tax revenues are more important than neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, with this decision, the rights of our citizens are now competing with tax revenue and private developments. The Constitution is meant to protect the rights of our citizens, not compete with the bottom line.

What is clear at this moment is that the Supreme Court has thrown the protection of individual property rights right out the window. These Justices need to be reined back in by both State action and loud condemnation of this outrageous finding.

Public use has been redefined so boldly by this Supreme Court decision that it's no wonder citizens are concerned about their homes and property.

In the short term, all states are encouraged to adopt strict and narrow definitions of "public use."

In the long term, we in Congress must determine whether more clarity needs to be brought to the court on this matter.

Remember Jefferson's principle: "The true foundation of republican government is the equal right of every citizen in his person and property and in their management."—Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, 1816.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court acted today, but if any of us want to know what real religious freedom and religious liberty is all about, I rise today to pay tribute to the Reverend Billy Graham.

Though many have said that the series of evangelistic sermons this past weekend in New York may be his last, he is a symbol of what America stands for and appreciates in freedom of religion. He spoke to all people.

I understand that in the early 1960s when it was not appropriate, he invited Dr. Martin Luther King to open one of his evangelistic meetings. He came to Nashville, Tennessee when it was not popular to do so.

In his audience of thousands and thousands over the weekend, we saw the faces of America, many colors, many different persons, many economic conditions. They came to hear the gospel said in an open and free society.

He pushes no agenda. He does not ask for the Ten Commandments to be placed in any place; but, he says, if you believe, then you should accept. That is what true religious freedom and liberty are all about.

That is why I am glad to be an American and believe in the first amendment. I salute the Reverend Billy Graham, a great American and a great patriot.

SHEDDING LIGHT ON THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, with the Supreme Court's decision regarding the Ten Commandments, they basically ruled as they had inferred, during oral arguments, as I witnessed them personally, in their chamber. They made fairly clear through their opinion that the only way the Ten Commandments are supposed to be displayed is if it is done in such a way as to render them completely meaningless.

Now, they just seem to have forgotten the fact that when the Founders and writers of the Constitution were alive, Old Testament scriptures, including the Ten Commandments, were frequently cited as a basis for laws being passed. Now, the majority has become wise in their own eyes to the detriment of the country, but it is only when the Ten Commandments are rendered completely meaningless that you can come out with a decision like we had the last 2 weeks where a city is allowed to take someone's property just because they think somebody may build a bigger, better, more expensive house; they can get more tax dollars.

We need to shed some light in the windowless ivory tower in which these decisions have been made.